



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

## Adoption

1 message

**Kevan Lynd** <klarchit@sbcglobal.net>  
 To: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org  
 Cc: NeighborhoodConservation@lacity.org

Thu, Sep 29, 2016 at 7:20 PM

Sharon,

I would like to comment on this section of the proposed BMO/BHO Ordinance

As written:

Sec. 15. Subdivision 6 of Subsection C of Section 12.08 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is renumbered as Subdivision 7 and is amended to read:

**7. Verification of Existing Residential Floor Area.** For additions with cumulative residential floor area of less than 1,000 square feet constructed after January 1, 2008, or remodels of buildings built prior to January 1, 2008, the existing residential floor area shall be determined based on the Building Records or the building square footage shown on the most recent Los Angeles County Tax Assessor's records or at the time the plans are submitted to the Department of Building and Safety and a plan check fee is paid. Except that residential floor area may be calculated as defined in Section 12.03 of this Code when a complete set of fully dimensioned plans with area calculations of all the structures on the lot, prepared by a licensed architect or engineer, is submitted by the applicant.

As an architect, this wording drives me nuts and would be so easy to correct.

1. The first sentence only refers to verification of RFA for existing additions. Is it supposed to refer to the entire house plus the addition? The way it is written it does not apply to an entire house, only additions. It should also clarify it is referring to completed or permitted additions, it could be interpreted as referring to proposed additions. It seems obvious now, because this ordinance was written after 2008. But one should not have to know when the ordinance was written to understand it's intention.

2. "or"? Building Records or Tax Assessor Records. If they vary which one governs?

3. "Except"? If a full set of complete dimensioned plans are submitted, which is generally required for any remodel, which interpretation do we use? The Building Records/Tax Assessor's Records or calculated from per Section 12.03? Who decides? The owner or the plan checker? If is the plan checker what criteria is used to decide which one governs? Also the current Building Records sizes will have been determined by the outdated code.

When these interpretations are left up to a plan checker, we go thru the expense of designing & engineering the project and submitting it to many departments & agencies only to be rejected and have to start again. When I've asked for interpretations before designing the project they are not binding and are often reversed by the assigned plan checker.

Today plans, even for small remodels, go to more and more agencies. It becomes exponentially more cumbersome when we cannot get clear direction.

I know the wording I am referring to was already in the code. But we should use these opportunities to clear these things up.

Yours Truly,

Kevan Lynd

Kevan Lynd Architect

3816 Willat Ave, Culver City, CA 90232

Klarchit@sbcglobal.net www.KLA-Architects.com

T:310-838-0466 F:310-838-0416



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

---

## Council File 14-0656 / opposition to code amendment

1 message

---

Zev Shechtman <zshechtman@gmail.com>

Thu, Sep 29, 2016 at 11:06 AM

To: "Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org" <Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org>, paul.koretz@lacity.org

Dear Councilman Koretz and Ms. Dickinson,

I'm a resident of the 5th Council District whose property will be impacted by the Council's decision on the proposed new home building restrictions. I understand that the opponents of development have been very vocal. But I don't understand the rationale for forcing people with a 5,000 square foot lot, like mine, to build a house that is less than 50% of the lot size. While 250 (i.e., 5%) square feet could make a meaningful difference to my enjoyment of my property, what is the rationale on the other side for preventing such construction? Also, can someone from the City explain what is wrong with the existing ordinances and why this drastic change is even necessary?

In sum, I oppose the amendment and believe that clearer explanation (in plain English) is needed.

Sincerely,

Zev Shechtman  
District resident and homeowner